



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE OLD ENGLISH GLOSSES PRINTED IN
KLUGE'S *ANGELSÄCHSISCHES LESEBUCH*.³

I. THE EPINAL GLOSSES.

ALREADY the first print of the Epinal glosses by Kluge in his 2d edition of the *Lesebuch* had been a decided improvement on that of Sweet in his *Old English Texts*, in so far as it had eliminated as purely Latin four of Sweet's entries (*fellitat* : *suggit*, No. 455, *perstromata*, *ornamenta* : *stefad brū*, No. 837 ; *tipo droco*, No. 1048 ; *yryseon* : *hereseorum*, No. 2175) on the one hand, and, on the other, had admitted five of those omitted by Sweet (*ansd*¹ *fibulae*, No. 3^a ; *cyprinus ornaeticki*, No. 178^a ; *iota soetha*, No. 516^a ; *lanx heolor*,² No. 573^a ; *merx merze*, 657^a), not counting *bothoma* : *embrin*, No. 308^a, which had been added by Sweet himself in the appendix. In the 3d edition of the *Lesebuch*, now before us, the number of glosses dropped has been augmented by one, *omentum* : *maffa*, No. 719 ; of new entries there is an increase by two, *genisculas muscellas*, No. 469^a, and *tubulo fala*, No. 1009^a. The withdrawal of *omentum maffa* from the text of the glosses as well as from the glossary, I am in hearty agreement with ; in fact, it affords me no little satisfaction to see that Kluge at last has heeded my

¹So Kluge ; ms. *ansa*. Does Kluge assume a strong masculine *fibul* ?

²The credit for having first given publicity to this important instance of *u*-umlaut of *e* in the *Epinal* is assigned to Kluge by Pogatscher in *Engl. Studien*, but it belongs to me, though Hessels may claim priority in so far as, in a note to *Corpus Glossary* 416, *laxhe. holor* (a gloss omitted by Sweet ; it should appear after his No. 1169), he drew attention to the corresponding gloss in the *Epinal-Erfurt*. But he explained *laxhe* merely as a corruption of *lanx*, evidently not being aware of the fact, brought out by me, that the first syllable of *he(h)olor* had been wrongly united with *lax* = *lāx* = *lanx* in the *Epinal-Erfurt* as well as in the *Corpus*. The reading of the *Erfurt*, *laxe olor* (so, not *laxe clor*, Goetz *C. G. L.* 5. 368. 37 prints) differs by omitting the initial *h* of the interpretation, probably through inadvertence of the scribe.

pleadings for the purely Latin character of the gloss, and Bülbring will do well to follow suit, for there is no such word in Old English as the *maffa*, 'Fetthaut um die Därme,' which he quotes in § 127^b of his *Elementarbuch* in support of a certain rule. The *maffa* of *Epinal*, *naffa* of *Erfurt*, is just as surely misreading or corruption of Latin *mappa*, with its by-form *nappa* (preserved in French *nappe*, English *nap-kin*), as *fannosū* (*lacinosū*) in the *Epinal* (Sweet's facsimile, p. 14, A 18), *fannossum* (*lacinossum*) in the *Erfurt* (Goetz, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 5. 370. 12) stands for *pannosum*, miswritten *panhosum* in the *Corpus*, which Sweet, *OET.*, p. 73, marks as OE., and peculiar to Cp. 1186, though as early as 1876 Zupitza, in his notice of Sweet's *History of English Sounds* (*AfdA* 2. 14, Anm.) had taken Wright to task for this ludicrous mistake. While I am convinced of the necessity of removing *maffa*, I am not so very sure about the propriety of admitting *muscellas* as Old English, especially as Kluge has entirely failed to make clear his position in regard to this alleged Old English form, and there is a Latin *muscella*. Is Kluge ready, on the strength of this gloss and of *Erf.* 1117 *genesco musscel*, to assume a strong masculine *muscel*, pl. *muscelas*? If so, why did he not say so in the glossary? There he puts *muscel* by the side of *muscl* with the designation *f.* (= *feminine*). And as a weak feminine the word is certainly testified to by all the other instances on record. How, then, can *muscellas* be considered the plural form of this weak feminine? But as there are instances of solitary strong forms (for example, of the weak feminine *mæltange* there is on record the strong gen. sing. *mæltanges*, *WW.* 150. 39), we might assume that *muscellas* is such a solitary strong plural form, were there nothing to combat the theory of such an assumption. Observe, in the first place, that the spelling is not favorable to the theory of an Old English form; it is not *muscelas* we read, but *muscellas*; in the second place, the reading of the *Erfurt* (*C. G. L.* 5. 363. 19), *genisculae muscellae*, is not favorable to the theory, either. If the lemma were *geniscula*, instead of *genisculae*, the English character of the interpretation, *muscellae*, might be easily admitted as established. As it is, the reading of the *Erfurt* looks as genuinely Latin as that of the *Epinal* does, and one

confirms the Latin character of the other. Doubtful, then, as the claim of admittance to the Old English list must appear to be in regard to *muscellas*, and vexatious as Kluge's silence is, it is still more so with respect to *fala* (gl. *tubulo*, as Kluge will have it). Here, again, we are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which determined the author to admit the word. He does not even refer to Hessels' edition of the *Corpus Glossary*, Introd., pp. 43-44, where—as far as I can see—the only valid reason that is adduced for considering *fala* Old English is because it appears *WW.* 279. 10 as *fealo* (gl. *tubulo*), and that might mean, as Hessels says, either 'fallow' or 'many.' What Kluge's idea in regard to the meaning of the word is, or what he thinks about the relationship of the reading *fala* (*Epinal-Erfurt-Corpus-Leiden*) to this *fealo*—of that he does not give us the slightest indication either in a note or in the glossary. This obligation to do so would seem to be all the more pressing, as in 'normalizing' the lemma he changed the reading of the *Epinal*—which is *tabula*, and has the support of the *Erfurt's tubulo*—to the *tubulo* of *WW.* 279. 10 quoted above. *Corpus* (Hessels, T 321) and *Leiden* 191 read *tubolo*. From this it would appear that the weight of evidence is actually in favor of *tubulo*, and we might easily reach the decision that this is the true form of the lemma, if it were borne out by the interpretation. But this is far from being the case, and I do not see how we can ever arrive at a satisfactory solution of the riddle presented by *fala* that would be in accord with a lemma *tubulo* 'small tube (pipe),' even if we make use of the help afforded by *fealo* (*tubulo*), pointed out by Hessels, and follow up either of his suggestions as to the meaning. If *tubulo* is the original form of the lemma, then we require for the interpretation something like what we read in the *Werden* gloss,¹ (Kluge, p. 9, l. 48) *theuta* (= *theuta* i. e. *theutan peotan*?) and we might suppose that *tubulo* stands for *tubulo*^{rum}, a gloss to (*voce*) *cataractarum* Ps. 41. 8,² and the fact that the *Vesp. Psalter* explains this

¹ Kluge prints *tubuli stemne theuta*, giving no hint that *stemne* is Gallée's conjecture for . . . *emne* of the ms.

² The *Werden* gloss, certainly, would seem to refer to this passage, if Gallée is right.

cataractarum by *peotena* might lend some probability to the supposition. But then Kluge must be ready to say that the *fala* (*fealo*) on record is a corruption of *ġuta* (*peato*) = *peutā* (*peotā*). Unless he can make this corruption of the interpretation probable, I do not see how *tubulo* as lemma can stand. At any rate, the meaning of *fala* (*fealo*) being as yet a riddle, it is unsafe to assert that *tubolo* (*tubulo*), rather than *tabula* (*tabulo*), is to be accepted as the proper reading of the lemma. With just as great a chance for being right, somebody might say that the reading of *Epinal-Erfurt* comes nearer the truth, standing for *stabulo*, and *fala* (*fealo*) he might take as originating from *fala ed* (*fealo*) = *falaed* (*feald*). *Fala ed* certainly is on record in the *Erfurt* 129 = *C. G. L.* 5. 347. 12, *bobellum fala ed*, and written thus in the archetypus could have easily given rise to the puzzling *fala* we have now to wrestle with. On *stabulum*, explained by *falaed*, see *Ep. Erf.* 959. As to *fealo* = *feald* (= *fald* ?), examples like *WW.* 543. 10, *scearnbudoa* = *scearnbudoa* = *scearnbudda*, or Goetz's misreading *dma* for *oma*, *C. G. L.* 5. 419. 10 = *Ld.* 88, or Wright-Wülker's *pundergeð*, for what Zupitze clearly read *punderngeð* = *punderngend*, *WW.* 70. 35, show plainly that there is a form of the *d* closely resembling *o*. On *tabulo* for *stabulo* cf. my remarks on *tignum tin* for *stagnum tin* (*Anglia* 14. 297).

We come now to the glosses omitted by Kluge, although containing Old English interpretations. Of course, I do not count among them either *anconos uncenos*, Sweet's 50*, added in the appendix, or *cripta ascussum*, which Sweet in the appendix bids us add after No. 599 of the *Corpus* glosses, but which is on record also in the *Epinal-Erfurt* (see *C. G. L.* 5. 358. 8). However, the following are surely entitled to a place among the Old English glosses of the *Epinal*:

1) *mulcet friat* (Sweet's facsimile, p. 15, C 39), on record also in *Corpus* M 350, *mulcet. lenit. friat*, and in the *Erfurt*, *C. G. L.* 5. 373. 8 *mulcet friad*. I was the first to point out in this *Journal* the Old English character of the interpretation, and have subsequently explained it in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, connecting it with the *frēon*, 'caress,' occurring in the Old English *Martyrology*.

2) *nauat frangat* i. e. *nauāt framgat* = *nauant framgath*, Sweet's facsimile, p. 16, A 39 = *Erfurt, C. G. L. 5. 374. 32* = *Corpus Glossary* N 34—also pointed out by me in this *Journal*.

3) *parabsides gabutan*, Sweet's facsimile, p. 18, F 25, added by Sweet in the appendix as No. 764^a. He ought to have remarked that it is on record also in the *Erfurt, C. G. L. 5. 379. 51*, with *parapsidam* as lemma; in the *Corpus*, P 27, the lemma is the same as in the *Epinal*, but the Old English interpretation appears in a different spelling, *gauutan*. What made Kluge disregard Sweet's *addendum* in this instance, I fail to see. The interpretation betrays its Old English character sufficiently by its ending, and had not Hessels, *Introd.* p. 43, top, drawn attention to the singular (nominative) *gabote* *WW. 280. 23?* For of course *parabsides gabote* stands for *parabsis, parabsidis gabote*. Sweet was therefore perfectly justified in giving *gabote* f. a place in his *Dictionary*. He might have added the older form *gabute* (*gauute*) from the *Epinal-Erfurt-Corpus* glosses just quoted.

4) *scurra lewis*, Sweet's facsimile, p. 25, A 36 = *Erfurt, C. G. L. 5. 393. 7*, = *Corpus Glossary* S 146 = *Ld. 142, histrio scurra lees*. The word is further testified to by *WW. 202. 32, leta cantatio lewisplega* (the gloss reads in full *cereuma uel celeuma idem et toma i. leta cantatio*, etc.). Cf. *Padelford, Old English Musical Terms*, p. 83.

5) *tractata tangi*, Sweet's facsimile, p. 27, C 19 = *Corpus Glossary* T 300. The *Erfurt, C. G. L. 5. 397, 33*, reads *zangi*, and this Old High German form, cropping up here, is clear evidence that in *tangi* we have an Old English word before us. I connect *tangi* with *-tang* in *gædertang* (*continuus Lib. Scint.*) and the well-known *getenge*. The lemma *tractata* will be corruption of *tracta*, *o* = *con-* being inadvertently omitted, and *-ta* repeated by dittography.

II. THE ERFURT² GLOSSES.

If we compare the print of these glosses in the third edition of the *Lesebuch* with that in the second, we find three differences: (1) the normalizing of the Latin lemmata is carried a

good deal further, (2) the reading of the Old English interpretation is changed in one instance, (3) two more of Sweet's entries are eliminated. With the normalized lemmata we shall not occupy ourselves for the present. As to the change of *giindi* (*conductium*) to *gimedi* (*conducticium*), let it suffice here to say that the change is made without informing the reader whether he has to do with a better reading of the ms. or the result of Kluge's conjectural activity. But of that later. What we are now concerned with are the glosses exhibited by Sweet, but excluded by Kluge. While in the second edition he had debarred only Sweet's No. 1102, *auehit bernit*, he has in the third omitted also Sweet's No. 1101, *acidus acacsore*, and No. 1122, *omentum maffa*. About the propriety of excluding the two last-named there cannot be any doubt, as I have shown them to be purely Latin. Sweet could not have printed them as containing anything Old English, had he given due weight to the parallel glosses in the other glossaries. For *maffa* compare what I have previously adduced. In regard to *acidus acacsore*, the *acidus ab acrore* of *Corpus A* 124 = *abdus. ab hacrore A* 68 = *abdus ab acrore* of *Erfurt* (*C. G. L.* 5. 343. 43) and *Epinal* (Sweet's Facsimile, p. 4, A 2) might have shown him that *acacsore* could not be corruption of *geacaessure*, which Kluge, however, once was quite ready to believe. As we see, he has now given up this belief, and one might wish he had done so also in regard to Sweet's No. 1105, *argata*¹ *uallae*, which Kluge prints in the second, as well as in the third edition, as *argatae uallae*. If the lemma is indeed *argatae*, then there is all the more reason to disbelieve in the English character of *uallae*. Kluge makes no attempt to explain *uallae*, nor has Sweet ever tried to explain it. My own effort in that respect I now consider futile. I am inclined to think that the gloss is a purely Latin one, and stands for *argute ualde* [*clare*], or something like that. I am less skeptical than Kluge about *bernit* glossing *auehit*. The English character of the interpretation seems to me more pronounced than in the case of *uallae*. *Bernit* can certainly be easily reduced to Old English *berit(h)*, if we assume that *n* is corruption of original *h*, as we

¹ So also Goetz.

know it to be in *nefern* for *hefern* (*cancer*), Sweet No. 1106. *Beril* would stand for an original Latin *portat*, and this is borne out by such a gloss as *auxere portauerunt*, *C. G. L.* 4. 486. 50. Curious is Kluge's attitude towards Sweet's No. 1108, *cunabula cynna* (= *C. G. L.* 5. 277. 17). This he has barred out, but in exchange has admitted what would appear as only a slight variation of it, *cunabula cyna*, which is Kluge's shortening of the *cunabula nutrimenta uel cyna infantium* of *C. G. L.* 5. 283. 9 (Götz). It would seem that, of the two, *cynna* has a more English look than *cyna*. But if we compare such glosses as *C. G. L.* 5. 60. 10, *cunabula infantiae cunae sunt panni in quibus infantes obuoluuntur*, and remember what Servius says, *ad Aen.* 3. 105, *cunabula gentis nutrimenta; nam ubi iacent infantes cunae uocantur*, we come to doubt the English character of *cyna* as well as *cynna*; Goetz in fact changes both to *cunae* (*Thes. Gloss. Emend.*, p. 295^a). Certainly the gloss in favor of whose reception Kluge has decided, shows plain traces of originating from the Servius passage just quoted. Then *cyna* must stand for *cunae*. For the gloss selected by Sweet so much may be said, that there is a chance that *cynna* is really OE.; it may be the genitive plural representing an original Latin *gentium*, and we may assume that the fuller gloss read something like *cunabula initia gentium cynna*. About as fair is the chance of the following glosses *not included* either in Sweet's or Kluge's list of Old English glosses from *Erfurt*²:

C. G. L. 5. 275. 23 *caraxatus autem*, where *autem* may be corrupted from *auten* = *auriten*.

276. 5 *cera (cela?) uria*.

293. 11 *fax facula uel licentia*. The *i* superscribed over *u* of *facula* by the first may be an indication that the scribe meant to make the Latin interpretation an Old English one = *faecilae*.

295. 4 *filistrus fimbria* may stand for *filis fimbria*.^{†[h]a[e]s}

420. 60 *phalanox per exercitus uel legio*; *phalanox* of course is *phalanx* and the following

- per* may be misreading by the continental scribe of OE. *Per*^{od} = *werod*.
308. 26 *libidū . . . micta* may stand for original *liuidū liquorē micta*. I am more confident of
331. 3 *scola mos*, which may go back to original *scola. i. hos*. I consider the lemma a Latinization of the Germanic *scolu* (*sčealu*, *sčeolu*), from which we have modern English *shoal* (see Kluge's *Etym. Wtb.* s. v. *Schar*.)

Another of Kluge's omissions is *hiatus fura*, *C. G. L.* 5. 300. 34; *fura* may well represent an original Latin *sulcorum*, and the gloss would be on a par with *cunabula cynna*, concerning which I give now the additional reference, *conabuli gepeode*, *WW.* 214. 33. That *hiatus* could well be applied to the opening of a furrow may be seen from *αῦλαξ sulcus hiatura*, *C. G. L.* 2. 250. 53 (reading of α).

Of undoubted English character is the interpretation of *C. G. L.* 5. 307. 30. Of the lemma only the first and last letters are readable now, but the *l nisi* cannot very well represent an original *leuitonarium*, as Landgraf in Wölflin's *Archiv. f. Lat. Lexicographie* 9. 390 proposed, since *leuitonarium* is the name of the sleeveless shirtlike garment of the Egyptian monks, according to Isidore's *Etym.* 19. 22. 24, while the OE. interpretation of our gloss, *uagrypt*, is a 'wall-covering,' usually explaining Latin *cortina*, *velum tentorium*. If we may venture a guess in so uncertain a case, *tentorium* is also, in the gloss at issue, the lemma, and we may read it, filling up the gap about this way: *tentorium uelum papilionis .i. uagrypt*. The *t* of *tentorium* could easily enough have been misread for *l*, and the gloss in the alphabetical arrangement had, of course, then to take its place under *L*, just as *sartago*, perverted to *cartago*, was put among the *C* glosses in the *Corpus Glossary*, *C* 199 (Hessels). *Tentorium* is explained by *papilio*, *C. G. L.* 5. 395. 22. That it means the hangings of a tent we learn from *Esther* 1. 6, *et pendebant ex omni parte tentoria aerii coloris*, etc.

The Old English glossator, explaining this passage, puts *uagryft* (MS. *uagryst*) as equivalent to *tentoria* in the Cod. St. Gall. 299 (*Ahd. Gl.* 1. 488. 2).

III. THE ERFURT³ GLOSSES.

The print of these glosses in Kluge's third edition hardly differs from that in the second, except that the lemmata are still more normalized than they were there. Of differences between Sweet's and Kluge's prints I have noticed the following: (1) Kluge has *fit* as interpretation of *ampusatio, una lectio*; Sweet, concurrently with Goetz, prints *fiit*, and remarks that the second *i* is under the line; (2) Kluge makes it appear that the gloss *cervix posteriora colli hnecca* is absent from E³, and on record only in the Werden fragment; but Goetz's print, *C. G. L.* 2. 572. 32, 33, shows that the gloss is extant also in E³, only the interpretation has been put on the previous line, probably for lack of space. Sweet's No. 1165, *cervix, posteriora colli: [hnecca]*, is therefore all right; (3) the interpretation of *caesius glaucus* is printed by Kluge as *ualdenegi*; Sweet has *ualdennegi*, and that coincides with Goetz's (2. 572. 34) *ualdē egi*. In regard to the interpretation of *laxitas*, Goetz concurs with Kluge in printing *placunis*, but he may have overlooked the stroke over the *u* which Sweet exhibits in *placūnis*; (4) Sweet prints the interpretation of *ilium* as *neisn' naensood*, Kluge exhibits no apostrophe mark affixed to *neisn*, Goetz (2. 582. 15) has *neisn̄ naensōod*. As Sweet nowhere exhibits the waved lines over the interpretations which usually mark them off as Old English, it would seem that he has read something different from the line over *n* in *neisn* which Goetz's print shows. In a case like this I believe it is of importance to know exactly what is on record in the MS., and it is to be regretted that, owing to the discrepancies between Sweet-Kluge-Goetz, we are left in doubt on that point; (5) Sweet's Nos. 1178, *iactus: boltio*, and 1179, *sagitta: sciutil*, appear as one gloss in Kluge-Goetz; moreover, Kluge has accepted Löwe's conjecture *bolus* for *boltio*, taking the word to be Latin, while Goetz retains *boltio*, explaining it as Middle Latin for 'Bolzen.' For the matter of that, so does Kluge in

his *Etym. Wtb.*⁶ s. v. *Bolzen*, and it is strange that here he should take a different position, and by his action wish to destroy an early testimony to *ML. boltio* which he appreciates so much in his *Etym. Wtb.*

A distinguishing feature of Kluge's print from that of Sweet are the supplementary glosses Kluge gives from the Werden fragment and the Münster leaves. That Sweet failed to incorporate the Werden glosses is—as Steinmeyer *AfdA.* 15. 243 points out—all the more remarkable since they had been printed in *Germania* (13. 479–80), and Loewe in his edition of *Erfurt*³ (*Glossae Nominum*) had made use of them to fill up the gap in the Erfurt. It may be well to mention here that the *prinſir*, appearing in Loewe's print (No. 329) as OE. interpretation of *bustuarium cauterium incisio membri*, has turned out to be abbreviation of Latin *pro infirmitate* of the Cantabrigensis (see *C. G. L.* 2. 570. 31, note). Also *constuc*, italicized under No. 365 as OE. interpretation of *carbonarius locus carbonum*, though on record both in *Erfurt*³ as well as in the Werden fragment, is claimed by Goetz (*C. G. L.* 2. 571. 25) as abbreviation of Latin *constructus*, as is evidenced by the reading of the Cantabrigensis, *carbonarius locus carboni constructus*. Here, however, there is a bare chance that the *Erfurt*³–*Werden* reading (*constuc*–*constūc*) may point to an OE. interpretation, after all. Notice, in the first place, that *Erfurt*³–*Werden* exhibit *constuc*, not *construc*. Secondly, *Erfurt*³ has, according to Goetz, *carbonarius locus carbonum*: *constuc*, which would seem to indicate the scribe's intention to mark *constuc* off as Old English. Still, there is the ; which may be meant for the ending *us*. Uncertain as the case is, I cannot help thinking that in the archetype of *Erfurt*³–*Werden* there may have been an Old English interpretation (*colstūc*) of *carbonarius*, which became mixed up with the abbreviated *constructus* of the original Latin gloss, and so gave rise to the *constuc* (*constūc*) we now read. In regard to *-stūc*, compare English dialectic *stook*. Of still more doubtful Old English character is the *kii*, apparently explaining *blanx moratus* in the Werden fragment, printed by Goetz, *C. G. L.* 2. 570. 15, note (Loewe, *Glossae Nominum*, No. 313, note). Attention to it should at least be drawn here. To my doubts

concerning the Old English character of *fiit*, or rather *fi_t*, as interpretation of *ampusatō una lectio*, I have repeatedly given expression in *Anglia*, and I still see reason to adhere to the position taken there. Goetz (*Thes. Gloss. Emend.*, p. 64^b, prints the gloss as *amputatio una lectio fiit*, and remarks (on the authority of Sievers?) that *fiit* stands for *fitt*, which is = OHG. *fizza*. I readily admit that the idea of an Old English *fitt* is favored by the *una lectio* of *Erfurt*³ and the waved line over *fi_t*, and certainly such an interpretation would fit in well enough with the meaning of *amputatio* in the sense of Jerome's *pericope* (Hieron. *In Joel* 2), concerning which cf. the Cyrillus gloss quoted by Loewe, *περικοπή amputatio*. On the other hand, the *uuaelectio fiit*¹ *sive uineae* of the Werden fragment forbids an unreserved belief in the English character of *fi_t*, and rather suggests a Latin *fit*. The original reading of the gloss may have been something like *amputatio est si uuae lectio fit sive sectio ramusculorum uineae*.

In printing the supplementary glosses from the Münster leaves, Kluge has again indulged in a large 'normalizing' of the lemmata, and this is the chief difference between his and Steinmeyer's print in *AfdA.* 15. 243 ff. Of other differences I have noticed the following: While Steinmeyer prints *cupellulus*, and takes the interpretation *bula* to be corrupted from *ampulla*, Kluge has *cupellulas*, and exhibits *bula* as Old English, making, however, no attempt at explaining it. Kluge also gives two glosses more than Steinmeyer: (1) *dudum ungeora* and (2) *pedules strapulas*. Kluge has taken no note whatever of the following supplementary glosses from the Cantabrigensis:

bartulus stamen = *battulus stamer* (*C. G. L.* 2. 569. 28);

EW have *stam* for *stamer*.

fuligo que anglice dicitur sot. (*C. G. L.* 2. 581. 4).

milba. glida (*milba* = *milwū*?) (*C. G. L.* 2. 587. 28).

strigula scafa (*C. G. L.* 2. 593. 64).

¹ It is not perfectly clear from Goetz's point whether the Werden fragment concurs with *Erfurt*³ in reading *fi_t* or *fiit*. As to the *Erfurt*³, Loewe (No. 140, note) seems to suggest that it was two glosses together, and that *fit* is in the MS.; he prints: 140 / 141 *ampusatō: una lectio fit, amputator: prae cisor ramusculorum uinae*.

The last two glosses I had pointed out to Goetz, but somehow he has failed to give me credit in the *Thesaurus*.

IV. ADDITIONAL GLOSSES SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE EVIDENCE OF ERFURT³ AND EPINAL.

Steinmeyer, in the fourth volume of his *Allhochdeutsche Glossen*, p. 179, note 5, draws attention to the fact that three of the glosses he prints on that page, ll. 8–10 from the *Admontensis* 508, are identical with *Erfurt*³ 1140–42, only that in the *Erfurt* they appear in an inverted order, as will be seen from the following:

<i>Admont. 508 :</i>	<i>Erfurt</i> ³ :
<i>alea tafle</i>	<i>albeus genus uasis trog</i>
<i>aleator tafleri</i>	<i>aleator tebleri aleae</i>
<i>albeus trog</i>	<i>alia tefil</i>

Query, does *tafle* in the *Admontensis* point to *aled*? Then there would be a point of contact with *Epinal*'s (No. 6) *aled teblae*, as Kluge prints it. With *alba spina hagindorn* of the *Admontensis* (*Ahd. Gl.* 4. 179. 11) we certainly may compare the *alba spina haguthorn* of *Epinal* 19. Here I should like to draw attention to the points of contact between the *Epinal* and the *Oxoniensis* (Auct. F. 1. 16.¹) glosses printed *Ahd. Gl.* 4. 245–46, and commented upon by Steinmeyer. I shall deal first with Column B of page 245, as there is an evident alphabetical arrangement, *f* and *v* apparently being considered as equivalents of *b*. Hence we have¹:

<i>Oxoniensis :</i>	<i>Epinal :</i>
<i>andela brandereda</i> (p. 245. 26) :	<i>andeda brandrad</i> (Sweet No. 4)
<i>arula fiurpanne t herd</i> (245. 27) :	<i>arula fyrpannae t herth</i> (No. 5)
<i>apiastrum biniuurt</i> (245. 28) :	<i>apiastrum biouuyrt</i> (No. 20)
<i>aesculus boke t ec</i> (245. 29) :	<i>aesculus boecae</i> (No. 22)
<i>aestuarium flod t bitalassum.</i>	<i>aestuarium fleotas</i> (No. 107) ; cp. <i>Corpus</i> (ed. Hessels) A 330 <i>aestuarium.</i>

¹The corresponding numbers of the *Epinal* are exhibited in brackets by Steinmeyer.

<i>ubi duo maria conueniunt</i> (245. 30-31):	<i>ubi duo maria conueniunt</i> , B 231 <i>bythlasma ubi duo maria conueniunt.</i>
<i>acinum hindbiri</i> (245. 32):	<i>acinum hindberie</i> (No. 69)
<i>villosa ruge</i> (245. 37):	<i>villosa ryhae</i> (No. 1080)
<i>villa lininhruge</i> (245. 38):	<i>villa linnin ryhae</i> (No. 1081)
<i>vadimonium borg</i> (245. 39):	<i>vadimonium borg</i> (No. 1090)
<i>bacinia beri</i> (245. 40):	<i>bucina</i> (= <i>bacinia</i>) <i>begir</i> (No. 143)
<i>botholicula stoppo</i> (245. 41):	<i>bothonicula stappa</i> (No. 122)
<i>bracium malt</i> (245. 42):	<i>bratium malt</i> (No. 130)
<i>bouellium faled</i> (245. 44):	<i>bobellum falaed</i> (No. 129)
<i>bradigabo feldhoppo</i> (245. 45):	<i>bradigabo felduuop</i> (No. 131)
<i>balista stafslengrie</i> (245. 46):	<i>ballista staebli drae</i> (No. 136)
<i>brancia kian</i> (245. 47):	<i>branciae cian</i> (No. 158)
<i>clauatum giburdid</i> (246. 3):	<i>clabatum gybyr did</i> (No. 228)

Column A of page 245 lacks the alphabetical arrangement except in so far as small groups seem to follow a certain alphabetical order:

<i>culcites bedd</i> (245. 5):	<i>culcites bedd</i> (No. 243)
<i>maialis barug</i> (245. 10):	<i>maialis bearug</i> (No. 652)
<i>murica snegil</i> (245. 11):	<i>maruca snegl</i> (No. 651) ¹
<i>muscus grimo</i> (245. 12):	<i>mascus grima</i> (No. 646) ¹
<i>migale harmo</i> (245. 13):	<i>megale hearma</i> (No. 666)
<i>esox lahs</i> (245. 15):	<i>isic leax</i> (No. 555) ¹
<i>lucius hacth</i> (245. 16):	<i>lucius haecid</i> (No. 587) ¹
<i>sardina hering</i> (245. 20):	<i>sardinas heringas</i> (No. 910)
<i>axedones id est humeruli lunisas</i> (245. 21):	<i>axedones lynisas</i> (No. 8)
<i>scorellus amer</i> (245. 22):	<i>scorellus emer</i> (No. 909)
<i>terebra et teretrum nauuger</i> (245. 23):	<i>terrebellus nabfogar</i> (No. 1010)
<i>crabro hornut</i> (245. 24):	<i>crabro hirritu</i> (No. 275)
<i>cerasius kirsicbom</i> (246. 1):	<i>cerasius cisirbeam</i> (No. 237)

¹ This number St. failed to point out. In regard to *murica* of *Admont.* as against *maruca* of *Epinal*, cf. *musica muscula animata* *Ahd. Gl.* 3. 476. 9. I believe *murica* to be correct, and a by-form of *murex*.

arnoglossa uuegbrede (246. 4): *arniglosa uuegbradae* (No. 65).

A small alphabetical group we have again on page 246^b:

petulans uurenisc (246. 25): *petulans t spurcus uuraeni* (No. 835)

pastellus hunegapl (246. 26): *pastellas hunaegaepl* (No. 830)

pustula angseta (246. 27): *pustula angseta* (No. 770).

There is no gloss in *Epinal* corresponding to *fasciola uinning* (245. 35). Steinmeyer proposes to read *uinning* as *uuinding*. But compare *fascia wyning* (*WW.* 125. 14) and *fascellas weoningas* (*WW.* 234. 22). Hence it would seem that *uinning* is rather a misreading of *uuining* than a by-form of *uuinding*. Kluge, in the glossary to his *Lesebuch*³, certainly recognizes *wining* (*weoning*) as authentic. As to *winding*, compare *Ahd. Gl.* 3. 150, note 19: *fascia windinc. Itē fasciat t fasciola*. Finally, let me draw attention to 245. 49, *cicindila uuocco*, and 245. 3, *floci sunt quos nos in uestimentis thiudisce uuuloo dicimus*. Steinmeyer compares with the former *WW.* 204. 22 = 498. 12, *cicindilibus weocum*; *ibid.* 267. 1, *cicindiliu weocan*. I refer to *iugum woce* and *tenticulam wocige, catenarum wociga*, quoted in my article *Anglo-Saxonica*, soon to appear in this journal. For *uuuloo* see Sweet No. 1066, *uillis uulohū*, in addition to *wlōh* (*fimbria*), quoted by Steinmeyer (note 2, p. 245).

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

WOLFENBÜTTEL, GERMANY.